Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 12 2017
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Nos. 16A-1190, 16A-1191

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

DONALD J. TRUMP, ET AL.,
Applicants,

v.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Applications to Stay Pending Disposition of a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and Pending Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AND BRIEF OF THE STATES OF VIRGINIA, MARYLAND, CALIFORNIA, CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW MEXICO, NEW YORK, NORTH CAROLINA, OREGON, RHODE ISLAND, VERMONT, AND WASHINGTON, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS AMICI CURIAE IN OPPOSITION TO THE STAY APPLICATIONS

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland
STEVEN M. SULLIVAN
Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
200 Saint Paul Place, 20th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410) 576-6427
ssullivan@oag.state.md.us

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General of Virginia
STUART A. RAPHAEL
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-7240
sraphael@oag.state.va.us

[Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

DONALD J. TRUMP, ET AL.,
Applicants,

v.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Applications to Stay Pending Disposition of a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and Pending Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

---

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AND BRIEF OF THE STATES OF VIRGINIA, MARYLAND, CALIFORNIA, CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW MEXICO, NEW YORK, NORTH CAROLINA, OREGON, RHODE ISLAND, VERMONT, AND WASHINGTON, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS AMICI CURIAE IN OPPOSITION TO THE STAY APPLICATIONS

The States of Virginia, Maryland, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, and the District of Columbia move this Court for leave to file the attached amicus brief in opposition to the stay applications.

All parties have consented in writing to the filing of this amicus brief and to waive the required 10 days' advance notice otherwise required by Supreme Court Rule 37.2(a).

As set forth in the attached brief, the Amici States and our residents will suffer irreparable harm if the Court stays the preliminary injunctions against enforcement of the travel ban and refugee ban in Executive Order 13,780. The amicus brief describes and documents those harms. Because the Court must balance the equities in evaluating the stay applications, and because balancing the equities requires the Court "to determine whether the injury asserted by the applicant outweighs the harm to other parties or to the public," *Lucas v. Townsend*, 486 U.S. 1301, 1304 (1988) (Kennedy, J., in chambers), the information in the amicus brief about those harms is crucial to the required analysis.

Accordingly, the Court should grant amici curiae leave to file the attached brief in opposition to the stay applications.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland
STEVEN M. SULLIVAN
Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
200 Saint Paul Place,
20th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410) 576-6427
ssullivan@oag.state.md.us

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General of Virginia
STUART A. RAPHAEL
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-7240
sraphael@oag.state.va.us

[Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTERESTS OF AMICI	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. IMPLEMENTING THE TRAVEL AND REFUGEE BANS WILL INFLICT IMMEDIATE IRREPARABLE HARM ON THE AMICI STATES AND OUR RESIDENTS.	4
II. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES STRONGLY FAVORS DENYING A STAY.	19
CONCLUSION	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
Agostini v. Felton, 521 U.S. 203 (1997)	16
Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez, 458 U.S. 592 (1982)	16
Aziz v. Trump, No. 1:17-cv-116, 2017 WL 580855 (E.D. Va. Feb. 13, 2017)	2
Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc. Grp. Hosp. Med. & Surgical Ins. Plan, 501 U.S. 1301 (1991)	3
Conforte v. Comm'r, 459 U.S. 1309 (1983)	20
Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962)	17
Graves v. Barnes, 405 U.S. 1201 (1972)	20
Hein v. Freedom From Religion Found., Inc., 551 U.S. 587 (2007)	16
Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183 (2010)	3
Lucas v. Townsend, 486 U.S. 1301 (1988)	3, 19
Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009)	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Rostker v. Goldberg,
448 U.S. 1306 (1980) 3, 20

San Diegans for the Mt. Soledad Nat'l War Mem'l v. Paulson,
548 U.S. 1301 (2006) 3

Washington v. Trump,
No. 2:17-cv-00141-JLR, 2017 WL 462040 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 3, 2017), *stay pending appeal denied*,
847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017) 2, 8

Whalen v. Roe,
423 U.S. 1313 (1975) 20

Williams v. Zbaraz,
442 U.S. 1309 (1979) 20

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. I, cl. 1 16

Cal. Const. art. I, §§ 4, 7-8, 31 17

Ill. Const. art. I, §§ 3, 17 17

N.M. Const. art. II, § 11 17

Va. Const. art. I, § 16 17

STATUTES

Cal. Civ. Code § 51, subd. (b) 17

Cal. Gov't Code §§ 11135-11137 17

Cal. Gov't Code §§ 12900-12996 17

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-60 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

740 Ill. Comp. Stat. 23/5(a)(1) 17

775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/1-102(A) 17

775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/10-104(A)(1) 17

Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 5, § 784 17

Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 5, §§ 4551-4634 17

Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606 17

Mass. Gen. L. ch. 93, § 102 17

Mass. Gen. L. ch. 151B, § 1 17

Mass. Gen. L. ch. 151B, § 4 17

N.M. Stat. Ann. § 28-1-7 17

Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1) 17

R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i) 17

Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9, §§ 4500-07 17

Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 21, § 495 17

Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1) 17

EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States, Executive Order 13,769 (Jan. 27, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017) .....*passim*

Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States, Executive Order 13,780 (Mar. 6, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017).....*passim*

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

COURT FILINGS AND DECLARATIONS Page(s)

Br. Amicus Curiae of Va., Md., et al. in Supp. of Appellees & Affirmance, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2017), ECF No. 153 2

Br. of Ill. et al. as Amicus Curiae in Supp. of Pls./Appellees, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125 2

Decl. of Asif Chaudhry, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. J 9

Decl. of Michael F. Collins, M.D., *Louhghalam v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-10154 (D. Mass. Feb. 2, 2017), ECF No. 52-2 12

Decl. of David Duea, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. O 15

Decl. of David L. Eaton, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. G..... 8

Decl. of Najwa Elyazgi, *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-116 (E.D. Va. Feb. 8, 2017), ECF No. 54 8

Decl. of Eva Hassett, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. N 15

Decl. of Deirdre Heatwole, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. A..... 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Decl. of Ross D. Lewin, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. F 11

Decl. of Vita Rabinowitz, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. H 11

Decl. of Eric Scherzer, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-00050 (D. Haw. Mar. 13, 2017), ECF No. 154-3, Ex. I..... 12

Defs.-Appellants' Resp. to Pls.-Appellees' Mot. for Leave to Supplement the Record, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 291..... 18

Joint Decl. of Madeleine K. Albright et al., *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 34-3..... 15, 19

Mem. of Law of N.Y., Mass., et al. as Amici Curiae States in Supp. of Pls.-Appellees, *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-35105 (9th Cir. Feb. 6, 2017), ECF No. 58-2 2

Mot. of Defs.-Appellants for a Stay Pending Expedited Appeal, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 35 18

Second Am. Compl., *Washington v. Trump*, 2:17-cv-00141-JLR (W.D. Wash. Mar. 16, 2017), ECF No. 152..... 2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

PRIMARY SOURCES Page(s)

Ill. State Univ., *Incoming Freshman / Enrollment Deposit* (2017), https://goo.gl/WqIaUT 10

James Madison Univ., *Admissions / Dates & Deadlines* (2017), https://goo.gl/5dPhal 10

Md. Office for Refugees & Asylees, *Refugees and SIV's Resettled in Maryland by Nationality*, FY 2012–FY 2016 (2017), https://goo.gl/zAAeDU 15

N.C. State Univ., *Electrical & Computer Engineering; Graduate Studies* (2017), https://goo.gl/STVx1E 10

State Univ. of N.Y. at Albany, *Admissions / Dates & Deadlines* (2017), https://goo.gl/i8fbG9 10

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Iran Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/gJwGAV 6

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Libya Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/LgEIkO 6

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Somalia Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/qIdYZh 6

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Sudan Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/2AHPFT 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Syria Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/plUXFZ 6

U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Yemen Reciprocity Schedule* (2017), https://goo.gl/vUuVQq 7

U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement, *Refugee Arrival Data* (Nov. 24, 2015), https://goo.gl/lDNhUU 14

Univ. of Cal., *How to Apply*; *Admissions Decisions* (2017), https://goo.gl/u8T31E ... 10

SECONDARY SOURCES

Azadeh Ansari, *FBI: Hate crimes spike, most sharply against Muslims*, CNN (Nov. 15, 2016), https://goo.gl/kyvh83 17

Abha Bhattarai, *Even Canadians are skipping trips to the U.S. after Trump travel ban*, Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017), https://goo.gl/a9tSjJ 13

Miles Bryan, *10 Prospective UIC Students Ineligible to Enroll Due to Travel Ban*, WBEZ (Mar. 6, 2017), https://goo.gl/rqRwzz 9

California Leads the Nation in Resettlement of Syrian Refugees, CBS SF Bay Area (Sept. 29, 2016), https://goo.gl/FmXRnj 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Randy Capps & Karina Fortuny, *The Integration of Immigrants in Maryland's Growing Economy*, Urban Inst. (Mar. 2008), https://goo.gl/wVjnez 14

Kirk Carapezza, *Travel Ban's 'Chilling Effect' Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions*, Nat'l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017), https://goo.gl/CqkNEy 8, 9

Marwa Eltagouri, *Hate crime rising, report activists at Illinois attorney general's summit*, Chi. Tribune (Feb. 24, 2017), https://goo.gl/uVeaiQ 17

Linda Givetash, *Girl Guides of Canada Cancels All Trips to U.S. Over Trump's Travel Ban*, Huffington Post (Mar. 14, 2017), https://goo.gl/OmOHWz 13

Matthew Haag & Jacey Fortin, *Two Killed in Portland While Trying to Stop Anti-Muslim Rant, Police Say*, N.Y. Times (May 27, 2017), https://goo.gl/MOzBcv 17

Derek Hawkins, *Worried about Trump's travel ban, Canada's largest school district calls off U.S. trips*, Wash. Post (Mar. 24, 2017), https://goo.gl/nqCv1t 13

Inst. of Int'l Educ., *Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety* (Mar. 31, 2017), https://goo.gl/pCky9C 4

NAFSA, *Benefits from International Students* (2017), https://goo.gl/G6nlWw 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

New Am. Econ., *The Contributions of New Americans in Illinois* (Aug. 2016), https://goo.gl/ 78amBf 14

Manya Brachear Pashman, *After sharp dip, refugee arrivals poised to increase*, Chi. Tribune (May 30, 2017), https://goo.gl/p98ZAt 16

Susan Svrluga, *'I felt loved': Libyan student, banned from entry to the U.S., is able to return to George Mason University*, Wash. Post (Feb. 7, 2017), https://goo.gl/4I216w 8

Alana Wise, *Travel to the United States rose in April, but industry remains wary*, Reuters (June 6, 2017), https://goo.gl/dzjfYT 13

The Amici States of Virginia, Maryland, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, and the District of Columbia urge this Court to deny the applications to stay the preliminary injunctions entered by the District Court of Maryland in *International Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump* ("*IRAP*") and by the District Court of Hawaii in *Hawaii v. Trump*.

INTERESTS OF AMICI[1]

The interests of the Amici States are directly and adversely threatened by the two provisions of Executive Order 13,780 (EO-2)[2] at issue here: the travel ban in § 2(c), preliminarily enjoined by the district courts in *IRAP* and *Hawaii*, and the refugee ban in § 6, preliminarily enjoined by the district court in *Hawaii*. Section 2(c) of EO-2 imposes a 90-day ban on entry to the United States by nationals from six overwhelmingly Muslim countries: Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. Section 6 imposes a 120-day ban on the entry of refugees under the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program and reduces refugee admissions in Fiscal Year 2017 from 110,000 to 50,000. The enjoined provisions are substantially similar to provisions in Executive Order 13,769 (EO-1),[3] which EO-2

---

[1] Pursuant to Rule 37.6, amici affirm that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part and that no person other than amici, their members, or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission. All parties have consented in writing to the filing of this amicus brief and to waive the required 10 days' advance notice otherwise required by Supreme Court Rule 37.2(a).

[2] 82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017).

[3] 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017).

rescinded after courts issued preliminary injunctions blocking their enforcement.[4]

Some of the Amici States have brought their own challenges to EO-2 or to its now-rescinded predecessor.[5] Others have filed amicus briefs supporting those challenges.[6] Permitting the enjoined provisions in EO-2 to take effect would inflict irreparable harm on the Amici States and our residents. Accordingly, the Amici States have a substantial interest in the outcome of these stay applications.

ARGUMENT

"To obtain a stay pending the filing and disposition of a petition for a writ of certiorari, an applicant must show (1) a reasonable probability that four Justices will consider the issue sufficiently meritorious to grant certiorari; (2) a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will vote to reverse the judgment below; and (3) a likelihood that irreparable harm will result from

---

[4] *See, e.g.*, *Washington v. Trump*, 2:17-cv-00141-JLR, 2017 WL 462040, at *2-3 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 3, 2017) (enjoining travel and refugee bans in EO-1), *stay pending appeal denied*, 847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017); *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-116, 2017 WL 580855, at *11 (E.D. Va. Feb. 13, 2017) (enjoining travel ban in EO-1 as applied to Virginia).

[5] *See* Second Am. Compl., *Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:17-cv-00141-JLR (W.D. Wash. Mar. 16, 2017) (challenge to EO-2 by Washington, California, Oregon, New York, Maryland, and Massachusetts, stayed pending appeal in *Hawaii v. Trump*), ECF No. 152; *Aziz*, 2017 WL 580855, at *1 (granting Virginia's motion to preliminarily enjoin § 3(c) of EO-1).

[6] *See* Ill. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125; Va. & Md. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2017), ECF No. 153; N.Y. & Mass. Amicus Br. (15 States and D.C.), *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-35105 (9th Cir. Feb. 6, 2017), ECF No. 58-2.

the denial of a stay."[7] In evaluating whether the circumstances warrant a stay, it "is ultimately necessary . . . 'to balance the equities.' "[8]

Balancing the equities requires the Court "to determine whether the injury asserted by the applicant outweighs the harm to other parties or to the public."[9] For the reasons explained in Amici's separate brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari in *IRAP*, this Court should not grant certiorari at this juncture, and the lower courts' decisions are correct on the merits. This brief explains why the balance of the equities tilts decidedly in favor of denying the stay applications.

The Amici States will be irreparably harmed if the travel and refugee bans take effect. The immediate adverse impact will be felt by our colleges and universities, with effects rippling through our economies based on disruptions to persons seeking to travel to the United States on student, family, work, and tourist visas, or to resettle as refugees. Reinstating the travel and refugee bans would also send an unmistakable message of exclusion and religious intolerance that would harm our communities. In light of the irreparable harm that a stay would impose on the States and our residents, and the applicants' failure to adduce

---

[7] *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2010); *see also San Diegans for the Mt. Soledad Nat'l War Mem'l v. Paulson*, 548 U.S. 1301, 1302 (2006) (Kennedy, J., in chambers) (describing similar standard for stay pending appeal to court of appeals).

[8] *Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc. Grp. Hosp. Med. & Surgical Ins. Plan*, 501 U.S. 1301, 1304 (1991) (Scalia, J., in chambers) (quoting *Rostker v. Goldberg*, 448 U.S. 1306, 1308 (1980) (Brennan, J., in chambers)).

[9] *Lucas v. Townsend*, 486 U.S. 1301, 1304 (1988) (Kennedy, J., in chambers).

any evidence of harm resulting from the preliminary injunctions, this Court should leave those injunctions in place while the litigation in *IRAP* and *Hawaii* proceeds to final judgment.

I. IMPLEMENTING THE TRAVEL AND REFUGEE BANS WILL INFLICT IMMEDIATE IRREPARABLE HARM ON THE AMICI STATES AND OUR RESIDENTS.

Allowing the travel and refugee bans to take effect would impose various categories of irreparable harm on the Amici States and our residents.

Harm to colleges and universities. The most immediate harm would be felt by our colleges and universities, and the students and faculty on whom they depend. A recent survey by the Institute of International Education (IIE) found that "more than 15,000 students enrolled at U.S. universities during 2015-16 were from the 6 countries named in [EO-2]."[10] The IIE estimates that, nationwide, "these students contributed $496 million to the U.S. economy, including tuition, room and board and other spending."[11]

Approximately half of those students attend colleges and universities in the Amici States and Hawaii. The following table[12] lists the number of such students in each Amicus State during the 2015-16 academic year and the economic benefits generated as a result:

---

[10] Inst. of Int'l Educ., *Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety* 3 (Mar. 31, 2017), https://goo.gl/pCky9C.

[11] *Id.*

[12] The data is found at *id.*, App. 1.

Amici States & Hawaii	Int'l Students & Scholars from 6 EO-2 Countries (2015/16)	Contribution to Economy
California	2,121	$56,800,000
Connecticut	189	$5,000,000
Delaware	70	$1,700,000
District of Columbia	131	$4,000,000
Hawaii	38	$1,200,000
Illinois	962	$28,100,000
Iowa	235	$6,800,000
Maine	31	$800,000
Maryland	361	$8,600,000
Massachusetts	1,033	$26,100,000
New Mexico	199	$6,300,000
New York	1,033	$28,800,000
North Carolina	435	$11,800,000
Oregon	311	$9,300,000
Rhode Island	56	$1,500,000
Vermont	23	$600,000
Virginia	477	$14,900,000
Washington	301	$9,700,000
Total	**8,006**	**$222,000,000**

As this table shows, colleges and universities in the Amici States and Hawaii account for more than 8,000 of the international students and scholars from the six countries, generating $222 million in economic benefits.

To be sure, the 90-day travel ban in § 2(c) does not apply to persons who were present in the United States on a valid visa as of the date of EO-1 (January 27, 2017) or EO-2 (March 6, 2017).[13] But allowing the travel ban to take effect would pose huge obstacles for students from the six countries, whether or not they were present in the United States on those dates. Because only single-entry visas are permitted for two of the countries, and because the required visas are valid only for relatively short periods, most students have to apply for a new visa during the course of their academic studies. In particular:

- students from Somalia are issued single-entry visas that are valid for 3 months;[14]
- students from Libya are issued single-entry visas that are valid for 12 months;[15] and
- students from Iran, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen are issued multiple-entry visas, but visas for Iran and Syria have a validity period of only two years,[16] while the validity period is only 12 months for Yemeni

---

[13] EO-2 § 3(a).

[14] U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Somalia Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/qIdYZh (select F-1 visa classification).

[15] *Id.*, *Libya Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/LgEIkO (select F-1 visa classification).

[16] *Id.*, *Iran Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/gJwGAV (select F-1 visa classification); *id.*, *Syria Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/plUXFZ (select F-1 visa classification).

students[17] and 6 months for Sudanese students.[18]

In other words, foreign students on single-entry visas who have relied on the existing preliminary injunctions—whether to return home for the summer, conduct research in other countries, or travel abroad for other reasons—face the prospect of being denied a visa to reenter the United States. And reinstating the travel ban would pressure all students from the six countries to cancel their enrollment for programs that exceed the visa-duration period, given that they can have no confidence that their visas will be renewed to enable them to complete their studies.

While EO-2 gives consular officers discretion to waive the travel ban for students from the six countries,[19] the discretionary nature of the review process means students have no assurance of readmission. EO-2 does not describe the process for applying for a waiver, does not specify the timeframe for receiving one, and does not set any concrete guidelines beyond providing a list of circumstances in which waivers "could be appropriate."[20] The ultimate decision whether to issue a waiver is committed entirely to "the consular officer's or the [Customs and Border Protection] official's discretion."[21]

That uncertainty alone will likely induce many students not to apply to universities in the United States.

---

[17] *Id.*, *Yemen Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/vUuVQq (select F-1 visa classification).

[18] *Id.*, *Sudan Reciprocity Schedule*, https://goo.gl/2AHPFT (select F-1 visa classification).

[19] EO-2 § 3(c).

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.*

The University of Washington, for instance, received various communications from prospective students from the affected countries expressing anxiety about applying in light of the travel ban.[22] Newly admitted students face similar uncertainties, particularly if they have not yet traveled to the United States. Allowing the travel ban to take effect would disrupt their educational planning and drive them to pursue alternative educational opportunities in countries that do not discriminate against them. Not surprisingly, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand have already seen a jump in applications following issuance of EO-1 and EO-2.[23]

Such anxieties are easy to understand. For instance, a fourth-year student at George Mason University in Virginia, who flew home to visit her family in Libya over winter break, was left stranded for a week in Istanbul after EO-1 took effect during the middle of her return trip to the United States. She was able to reenter the United States to resume her studies only after the district court issued a temporary restraining order in *Washington v. Trump*. She had the highest high-school GPA in Libya in 2011, earned a full college scholarship, and chose to study here. But the "nightmare" she experienced has prompted her to look to Canada for her graduate studies.[24] EO-1 likewise

---

[22] Decl. of David L. Eaton ¶ 5 & Ex. 2, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. G.

[23] Kirk Carapezza, *Travel Ban's 'Chilling Effect' Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions*, Nat'l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017), https://goo.gl/CqkNEy.

[24] Decl. of Najwa Elyazgi, *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-116 (E.D. Va. Feb. 8, 2017), ECF No. 54; *see also* Susan Svrluga, *'I felt loved': Libyan student, banned from entry to the U.S., is able to return to George Mason University*, Wash. Post (Feb. 7, 2017), https://goo.gl/4I216w.

blocked ten of Iran's top engineering students who had been admitted to the doctoral engineering program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, forcing them to look to programs in Canada as well.[25]

Moreover, the climate of uncertainty and discrimination created by the travel ban appears to be deterring international students from countries *other* than the six targeted by EO-2. A recent survey found that 80% of college registrars and admissions officers were concerned about the application yield of international students in the wake of EO-1 and EO-2.[26] For instance, the Special Education Program at Washington State University's Department of Teaching and Learning has seen the number of international applications drop from 63 last year to just ten this year.[27] Forty percent of colleges surveyed report a drop in applications from foreign students.[28] The Deputy Director of the American Association of College Registrars and Universities recently reported seeing an increase in foreign students "hedging their bets," applying to schools in " 'Canada, the U.K., Australia and New Zealand.' "[29] These are clear warning signs that allowing the travel ban to take effect would devastate the ability of American schools to attract and retain talented foreign students.

A stay of the injunctions would also pull the rug out from under students from the six targeted countries

---

[25] Miles Bryan, *10 Prospective UIC Students Ineligible to Enroll Due to Travel Ban*, WBEZ (Mar. 6, 2017), https://goo.gl/rqRwzz.

[26] Carapezza, *supra* note 23.

[27] Decl. of Asif Chaudhry ¶ 9, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. J.

[28] Carapezza, *supra* note 23.

[29] *Id.*

who have already accepted admission (or decided to continue their enrollment) for the fall academic semester, in reliance on the belief that the travel ban was enjoined. The commitment deadline has already passed for most colleges and universities; for others, it is imminent.[30] The inevitable adverse publicity that would flow from blocking those students' ability to matriculate would haunt our colleges and universities for years to come.

Every foreign student deterred or blocked from enrolling results in both tangible and intangible harms to the States. The loss of international students and scholars inhibits the free exchange of information, ideas, and talent that is so essential to academic life in our nation's colleges and universities. The tangible economic harms would also be serious. "For every seven international students enrolled, three U.S. jobs are created and supported by spending occurring in the higher education, accommodation, dining, retail, transportation, telecommunications and health insurance sectors."[31] As noted above, economic benefits of $496 million were generated as a result of foreign students from the six targeted countries during the 2015-16 academic year, with $222 million alone generated in the Amici States.

Permitting the travel ban to take effect would have similar adverse impacts on current and potential fac-

---

[30] *See, e.g.*, Univ. of Cal. (May 1), https://goo.gl/u8T31E; Ill. State Univ. (May 1), https://goo.gl/WqIaUT; James Madison Univ. (May 1), https://goo.gl/5dPhal; SUNY Albany (May 1), https://goo.gl/i8fbG9; N.C. State Grad. Eng'g Program (June 15), https://goo.gl/STVx1E.

[31] NAFSA, *Benefits from International Students* (2017), https://goo.gl/G6nlWw.

ulty members. For example, the University of Massachusetts employed in the previous academic year, in various academic departments, approximately 130 employees from the affected countries who are neither lawful permanent residents nor U.S. citizens.[32] The University of Maryland relies on "more than 200 graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and faculty from the designated countries to staff its science laboratories."[33] "The loss of just one of these researchers will disrupt work and delay progress for an entire lab."[34]

Permitting the travel ban to take effect would also harm recruitment of faculty and researchers, many of whom work in specialized fields. The City University of New York ("CUNY") Graduate Center is currently negotiating with an international senior research scholar who has expressed serious concerns about moving to the United States in the shadow of the travel ban.[35] CUNY's Baruch College, which hires a significant number of foreign faculty members, already reports that potential faculty members are voicing concerns about travel restrictions that would interfere with family obligations such as caring for elderly parents, attending important family events, and participating in cultural holidays.[36]

Harm to medical institutions. Allowing the travel ban to take effect would also threaten public hospitals,

---

[32] Decl. of Deirdre Heatwole ¶¶ 4-10, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. A.

[33] Decl. of Ross D. Lewin ¶ 8, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. F.

[34] *Id.*

[35] Decl. of Vita Rabinowitz ¶ 21, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. H.

[36] *Id.*

which employ physicians and medical residents, research faculty, and postdoctoral researchers from the designated countries. Qualified individuals from those countries have accepted job offers from Amici States' hospitals, but must await visa approval and are uncertain if or when they can start work.[37] Uncertainty created by EO-1 and EO-2 has already had "a profound chilling effect" on international students' applications to State hospitals' residency programs, imposing "a major disincentive for hospitals to select foreign nationals for their residency programs."[38] The consequent risk of understaffing medical facilities threatens harm to the States and to the health of their inhabitants.

Lost tax revenues. Implementing the travel and refugee bans would also cost Amici States significant tax revenues. Foreign students, tourists, business visitors, and resettled refugees contribute to our State treasuries, not only through direct payments like tuition and fees, but also through tax receipts from the businesses they patronize and the goods and services they purchase. Blocking thousands of travelers from entering the Amici States will halt their tax contributions.

The broader chilling effect on tourism would be even more extensive if the travel ban is reinstated, operating as a giant warning sign that foreign visitors are unwelcome. EO-2 has already prompted Canada's largest school district and one of its nationwide youth

---

[37] *See, e.g.*, Decl. of Michael F. Collins, M.D. ¶ 9, *Louhghalam v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-10154 (D. Mass. Feb. 2, 2017), ECF No. 52-2.

[38] Decl. of Eric Scherzer ¶ 15, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-00050 (D. Haw. Mar. 13, 2017), ECF No. 154-3, Ex. I.

organizations to suspend U.S. travel.[39] An estimated 4.3 million fewer people are expected to visit the United States this year, "resulting in $7.4 billion in lost revenue . . . . Next year, the fallout is expected to be even larger, with 6.3 million fewer tourists and $10.8 billion in losses."[40] The preliminary injunctions may have helped stanch the losses in tourism revenue; with the injunctions in place, international inbound travel ticked up in April 2017, compared to April 2016, but travel-industry experts have cautioned that "uncertainty about the Trump Administration's policies could discourage foreign visitors in the months ahead."[41] Reviving the travel and refugee bans would certainly make America a less welcoming destination for foreign tourists.

Lasting harm to States' economies. The travel and refugee bans also threaten profound, long-term economic harm. The message of intolerance and uncertainty conveyed by EO-2 threatens Amici States' ability to continue attracting and retaining the foreign professionals, entrepreneurs, and companies that are mainstays of our economies. For example, foreign-born residents comprise 22.1% of the entrepreneurs

---

[39] Derek Hawkins, *Worried about Trump's travel ban, Canada's largest school district calls off U.S. trips*, Wash. Post (Mar. 24, 2017), https://goo.gl/nqCv1t; Linda Givetash, *Girl Guides Of Canada Cancels All Trips To U.S. Over Trump's Travel Ban*, Huffington Post (Mar. 14, 2017), https://goo.gl/OmOHWz.

[40] Abha Bhattarai, *Even Canadians are skipping trips to the U.S. after Trump travel ban*, Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017), https://goo.gl/a9tSjJ.

[41] Alana Wise, *Travel to the United States rose in April, but industry remains wary*, Reuters (June 6, 2017), https://goo.gl/dzjfYT.

and 37.7% of the software developers in Illinois,[42] and 27% of scientists, 21% of health care practitioners, and 19% of mathematicians and computer specialists in Maryland.[43] A recent study found that if even half of the more than 3,900 foreign-born graduates of Illinois universities in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) stayed in the United States after graduation, it could result in the creation of more than 5,100 new jobs for U.S.-born workers by 2021.[44] Even a temporary disruption in the flow of these highly skilled workers into the United States puts companies across the country at a disadvantage compared to their global competitors, and threatens to act as a brake on our State economies.

Harm to refugee resettlement efforts. EO-2 also hinders the efforts of the Amici States to resettle and assist refugees. Between 2012 and 2015, California accepted 23,382 refugees, including 5,668 from Iran, 225 from Syria, and 119 from Sudan.[45] Between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016, California resettled 1,450 Syrian refugees, more than any other State.[46] According to the Maryland Office for Refugees and Asylees, during the five-year period ending September 30,

---

[42] New Am. Econ., *The Contributions of New Americans in Illinois* 2, 10 (Aug. 2016), https://goo.gl/78amBf.

[43] Randy Capps & Karina Fortuny, *The Integration of Immigrants in Maryland's Growing Economy* 2, Urban Inst. (Mar. 2008), https://goo.gl/wVjnez.

[44] *The Contributions of New Americans in Illinois*, *supra* note 42, at 13.

[45] U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement, *Refugee Arrival Data* (Nov. 24, 2015), https://goo.gl/lDNhUU.

[46] *California Leads The Nation In Resettlement Of Syrian Refugees*, CBS SF Bay Area (Sept. 29, 2016), https://goo.gl/FmXRnj.

2016, 1,121 refugees from the six designated countries were resettled in Maryland.[47]

Had it not been enjoined by the *Hawaii* court, § 6 of EO-2 would have stranded in crisis zones thousands of refugees—despite the fact that they have already been extensively vetted—in many cases isolating them from family members who are already in the United States.[48] In addition, it would have indefinitely excluded tens of thousands of otherwise eligible refugees by reducing the cap for Fiscal Year 2017 by more than half, from 110,000 to 50,000. Resettlement agencies whose funding is allocated on a per-arrival basis thereby face a reduction in resources if that provision takes effect. For example, the International Institute of Buffalo, which provides refugee resettlement services, has planned to lay off six employees as a result of the refugee ban.[49] Lutheran Community Services Northwest, based in Washington, has notified 15 of its 35 refugee assistance employees that they will be laid off if the refugee provisions take effect.[50] Such reductions in services have a constricting effect on local economies as employees are let go, interpreters are no longer hired, and fewer resettled refugees are available to help revitalize economically depressed neighborhoods.[51] The

---

[47] Md. Office for Refugees & Asylees, *Refugees and SIV's Resettled in Maryland by Nationality, FY 2012–FY 2016* (2017), https://goo.gl/zAAeDU.

[48] *See* Joint Decl. of Madeleine K. Albright et al. ¶ 6, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 34-3, J.A. 666 ("Refugees receive the most thorough vetting of any traveler to the United States, taking on the average more than a year.").

[49] Decl. of Eva Hassett ¶ 21, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. N.

[50] Decl. of David Duea ¶ 9, *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125, Ex. O.

[51] Decl. of Eva Hassett, *supra* note 49, ¶¶ 22-25.

preliminary injunction entered by the court in *Hawaii* saved refugee resettlement organizations from having to drastically reduce their personnel, and the State Department has since advised such organizations to expect an increase in refugee arrivals.[52] Reinstating the refugee restrictions would do unnecessary damage to the vital services performed by these organizations.

Harm to States' Muslim communities. The travel and refugee bans also threaten to undermine our States' constitutional and statutory commitments to religious tolerance and diversity. Each State has an interest in "securing observance of the terms under which it participates in the federal system,"[53] including the Establishment Clause.[54] The Establishment Clause is a structural limitation on the exercise of federal power, including Executive power.[55] "It was in large part to get completely away from . . . systematic religious persecution that the Founders brought into being our Nation," with an express "prohibition against any governmental establishment of religion" in order to protect religious beliefs from "the pressures of gov-

---

[52] Manya Brachear Pashman, *After sharp dip, refugee arrivals poised to increase*, Chi. Tribune (May 30, 2017), https://goo.gl/p98ZAt.

[53] *Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 607-08 (1982).

[54] U.S. Const. amend. I, cl. 1.

[55] *See, e.g.*, *Hein v. Freedom From Religion Found., Inc.*, 551 U.S. 587, 614 (2007) (plurality opinion) (noting that a party with standing may bring an Establishment Clause challenge to spending by an executive agency that advances religious purposes); *id.* at 639-40 (Souter, J., dissenting) ("[N]o one has suggested that the Establishment Clause lacks applicability to executive uses of money."); *Agostini v. Felton*, 521 U.S. 203, 244 (1997) (Souter, J., dissenting) (describing the Establishment Clause as among the Constitution's "structural and libertarian guarantees").

ernment for change each time a new political administration is elected to office."[56] To safeguard our residents' rights, Amici States have adopted constitutions and other laws that protect against discrimination, including laws prohibiting our residents, businesses, and state and local governments from conditioning employment and other opportunities on national origin and religion.[57] EO-2 undermines those efforts.

Allowing the travel and refugee bans to take effect would occur at the same time that hate crimes against Muslims are on the rise. In the Chicago area alone, 175 hate-related incidents were reported in the first two months of 2017, compared to 400 hate crimes reported in all of 2016.[58] On May 26, an assailant shouting anti-Muslim rants at two women in Portland, Oregon fatally stabbed two men and wounded a third as they tried to come to the women's defense.[59] Permitting the travel ban to take effect against citizens from overwhelmingly Muslim countries will only embolden

---

[56] *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 430, 433 (1962).

[57] *See, e.g.*, Cal. Const. art. I, §§ 4, 7-8, 31; Cal. Gov't Code §§ 11135-11137, 12900-12996; Cal. Civ. Code § 51, subd. (b); Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-60; Ill. Const. art. I, §§ 3, 17; 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. 23/5(a)(1); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/1-102(A); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/10-104(A)(1); Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 5, §§ 784, 4551-4634; Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606; Mass. Gen. L. ch. 151B, §§ 1, 4; *id.* ch. 93, § 102; N.M. Const. art. II, § 11; N.M. Stat. Ann. § 28-1-7; Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1); R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i); Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9, §§ 4500-07; Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 21, § 495; Va. Const. art. I, § 16; Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1).

[58] Marwa Eltagouri, *Hate crime rising, report activists at Illinois attorney general's summit*, Chi. Tribune (Feb. 24, 2017), https://goo.gl/uVeaiQ; *see also* Azadeh Ansari, *FBI: Hate crimes spike, most sharply against Muslims*, CNN (Nov. 15, 2016), https://goo.gl/kyvh83.

[59] Matthew Haag & Jacey Fortin, *Two Killed in Portland While Trying to Stop Anti-Muslim Rant, Police Say*, N.Y. Times (May 27, 2017), https://goo.gl/MOzBcv.

the intolerant and amplify the message of fear and intimidation communicated to our Muslim communities.

By its express terms, the travel ban expires on June 14—90 days after it took effect.[60] The applicants, for their part, have taken irreconcilable positions on whether that time period has been running (and whether the 120-day period has been running on the refugee ban). In *IRAP*, the Acting Solicitor General told the Fourth Circuit that "Section 2(c)'s 90-day suspension *expires in early June*."[61] But in subsequent briefing, the applicants claimed that the 90-day period had not even begun to run, based on three alternative theories:

> Whether because Section 2(c) was never permitted to take effect on [its effective date], or because the "effective date" for Section 2(c) has been tolled during the pendency of the injunctions, or because those injunctions prevented Section 14's effective date from applying to Sections 2 and 3 (and those applications are severable under the express severability clause in Section 15), the Order's 90-day suspension will begin when the injunctions are lifted . . . .[62]

---

[60] *See* EO-2 § 2(c) (suspending entry of nationals from six countries "for 90 days from the effective date of this order"), § 14 ("This order is effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern daylight time on March 16, 2017.").

[61] Mot. of Defs.-Appellants for a Stay Pending Expedited Appeal at 11, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 35 (emphasis added).

[62] Defs.-Appellants' Resp. to Pls.-Appellees' Mot. for Leave to Supplement the Record at 2-3, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 291.

We do not know which position to credit, and the applicants did not pick one in their three filings in this Court. However that question is ultimately resolved, we know one thing for certain: the harm to Amici States and our residents from reinstating the travel and refugee bans, even for a limited time, would be irreparable.

II. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES STRONGLY FAVORS DENYING A STAY.

As noted at the outset, balancing the equities involved in a stay application requires the Court "to determine whether the injury asserted by the applicant outweighs the harm to other parties or to the public."[63] In considering these applications, therefore, the Court should take account of the irreparable harm described above that will be inflicted on the Amici States and our residents if the travel ban is permitted to take effect. The balance of equities here tips decidedly in favor of maintaining the preliminary injunctions pending review.

The applicants' interests do not outweigh the injury to the States and our residents that would result from permitting the travel ban to take effect. At no time in either the *IRAP* or *Hawaii* litigation have the applicants offered any evidence to rebut the joint declaration of numerous national security experts who explained why enjoining the travel and refugee bans pending a final decision on the merits "would not jeopardize national security."[64] As those experts noted, "[s]ince September 11, 2001, not a single terrorist attack in the United States has been perpetrated by aliens

---

[63] *Lucas*, 486 U.S. at 1304.

[64] Joint Decl. of Madeleine K. Albright et al. ¶ 9, *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Mar. 24, 2017), ECF No. 34-3, J.A.667.

from the countries named in the Order."[65] Accordingly, the applicants have failed to carry their "heavy burden"[66] to show that the preliminary injunctions should be stayed pending final disposition of the underlying litigation.

A "presumptive correctness" attaches to the lower court's disposition,[67] a presumption that applies not only to ruling on "the merits," but also to rulings involving an "interim disposition of the case."[68] Thus, Justices have "weighed heavily the fact that the lower court refused to stay its order pending appeal, indicating that it was not sufficiently persuaded of the existence of potentially irreparable harm as a result of enforcement of its judgment in the interim."[69] When the lower courts have already balanced the equities, as here, their "decision is entitled to weight and should not lightly be disturbed."[70] "Balancing the equities is always a difficult task, and few cases are ever free from doubt."[71] "Where there is doubt," however, "it should inure to the benefit of those who *oppose* grant of the extraordinary relief which a stay represents."[72]

---

[65] *Id.* ¶ 4, J.A.667.

[66] *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 439 (2009) (Kennedy, J., concurring) (quoting *Williams v. Zbaraz*, 442 U.S. 1309, 1311 (1979) (Stevens, J., in chambers)).

[67] *Conforte v. Comm'r*, 459 U.S. 1309, 1311 n.1 (1983) (Rehnquist, J., in chambers).

[68] *Rostker*, 448 U.S. at 1308.

[69] *Whalen v. Roe*, 423 U.S. 1313, 1317 (1975) (Marshall, J., in chambers) (quoting *Graves v. Barnes*, 405 U.S. 1201, 1203-04 (1972) (Powell, J., in chambers)).

[70] *Zbaraz*, 442 U.S. at 1312; *see also Whalen*, 423 U.S. at 1316.

[71] *Zbaraz*, 442 U.S. at 1315.

[72] *Id.* at 1316 (emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

The applications to stay the preliminary injunction orders should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland
STEVEN M. SULLIVAN
Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
200 Saint Paul Place, 20th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410) 576-6427
ssullivan@oag.state.md.us

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
1300 I Street, Suite 125
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, California 94244

GEORGE JEPSEN
Attorney General of Connecticut
55 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

MATTHEW P. DENN
Attorney General of Delaware
Carvel State Building, 6th Floor
820 North French Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General of Illinois
100 West Randolph Street,
12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General of Virginia
STUART A. RAPHAEL
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-7240
sraphael@oag.state.va.us

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
Attorney General of New York
120 Broadway, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10271

JOSH STEIN
Attorney General of North Carolina
9001 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General of Oregon
1162 Court Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97301

PETER F. KILMARTIN
Attorney General of Rhode Island
150 S. Main Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

TOM MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa
1305 E. Walnut Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

JANET T. MILLS
Attorney General of Maine
6 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of Massachusetts
One Ashburton Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

HECTOR BALDERAS
Attorney General of New Mexico
408 Galisteo Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
Attorney General of Vermont
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05609

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General of Washington
1125 Washington Street S.E.
P.O. Box 40100
Olympia, Washington 98504

KARL A. RACINE
Attorney General of the District of Columbia
441 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

TREVOR S. COX
Deputy Solicitor General
MATTHEW R. MCGUIRE
Assistant Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-7240